

1 PAUL, HASTINGS, JANOFSKY & WALKER LLP  
2 NED N. ISOKAWA (SB# 66287)  
3 [nedisokawa@paulhastings.com](mailto:nedisokawa@paulhastings.com)  
4 JASON K. SONODA (SB# 248105)  
5 [jasonsonoda@paulhasting.com](mailto:jasonsonoda@paulhasting.com)  
6 55 Second Street, Twenty-Fourth Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94105-3441  
Telephone: (415) 856-7000  
Facsimile: (415) 856-7100

7 MCKOOL SMITH, P.C.  
8 THEODORE STEVENSON, III (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
9 [tstevenson@mckoolsmith.com](mailto:tstevenson@mckoolsmith.com)  
10 SCOTT W. HEJNY (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
11 [shejny@mckooksmith.com](mailto:shejny@mckooksmith.com)  
12 LUKE F. MCLEROY (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
13 [lmcleroy@mckoolsmith.com](mailto:lmcleroy@mckoolsmith.com)  
14 300 Crescent Court, Suite 1500  
15 Dallas, TX 75201  
Telephone: (214) 978-4000  
Facsimile: (214) 978-4044  
www.mckoolsmith.com  
Attorneys for Defendant  
i2 Technologies, Inc.

16 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
17 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
18 OAKLAND DIVISION  
19

20 SAP AKTIENGESELLSCHAFT, a  
21 German corporation,

22 Plaintiff,

23 vs.

24 i2 TECHNOLOGIES, INC., a Delaware  
25 corporation,

26 Defendant.  
27  
28

CASE NO. 4:07-cv-04187-SBA

**DEFENDANT i2'S ANSWER AND  
COUNTERCLAIMS TO PLAINTIFFS'  
SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR  
PATENT INFRINGEMENT**

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

1 Defendant i2 Technologies, Inc. (“i2”) hereby answers SAP Aktiengesellschaft’s  
2 (“Plaintiff’s”) Second Amended Complaint for Patent Infringement (“Complaint”) as follows:

3 **NATURE OF THE ACTION**

4 1. i2 admits that the present case is an action for patent infringement of U.S. Patent  
5 Nos. 6,407,761 (“the ‘761 patent”), 6,750,766 (“the ‘766 patent”), and 7,222,369 (“the ‘369  
6 patent”) (collectively, the “Patents in Suit”). i2 denies that remaining allegations in Paragraph 1  
7 of the Complaint.

8 **PARTIES**

9 2. i2 lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the  
10 allegations in Paragraph 2 of the Complaint and, therefore, denies the same.

11 3. i2 admits that it is a Delaware Corporation with a place of business at 11701 Luna  
12 Road, Dallas, Texas 75234. i2 also admits that it has an office at 1250 Oakmead Parkway, Suite  
13 210, Sunnyvale, California 94085.

14 **SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION**

15 4. i2 admits that this Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this dispute. i2 denies  
16 the remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 4 of the Complaint.

17 **VENUE**

18 5. i2 admits that venue is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391 and  
19 1400. i2 denies that venue is convenient for the parties and witnesses or in the interest of justice  
20 and reserves its right to challenge venue under 28 U.S.C. § 1404.

21 **FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

22 **(Infringement of the ‘761 Patent)**

23 6. i2 incorporates by reference its responses to Paragraphs 1-5 above.

24 7. i2 admits that the ‘761 patent is entitled “System and Method for the Visual  
25 Customization of Business Object Interfaces” and issued on June 18, 2002, but denies that the  
26 ‘761 patent was duly and legally issued. i2 lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a  
27 belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 7 of the Complaint and, therefore,  
28 denies the same.

8. i2 denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 8 of the Complaint.

9. i2 denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 9 of the Complaint.

**SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

**(Infringement of the '766 Patent)**

10. i2 incorporates by reference its responses to Paragraphs 1-5 above.

11. i2 admits that the '766 patent is entitled "Alerts Monitor" and issued on June 15, 2004, but denies that the '766 patent was duly and legally issued. i2 lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 11 of the Complaint and, therefore, denies the same.

12. i2 denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 12 of the Complaint.

13. i2 denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 13 of the Complaint.

**THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

**(Infringement of the '369 Patent)**

14. i2 incorporates by reference its responses to Paragraphs 1-5 above.

15. i2 admits that the '369 patent is entitled "Role-based portal to a workplace system" and issued on May 22, 2007, but denies that the '369 patent was duly and legally issued. i2 lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 15 of the Complaint and, therefore, denies the same.

16. i2 denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 16 of the Complaint.

17. i2 denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 17 of the Complaint.

**PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

18. i2 denies that Plaintiff is entitled to any form of relief, including that sought in Plaintiff's prayer for relief.

**FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

19. i2 does not infringe and has not infringed any of the Patents in Suit.

**SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

20. The claims of the Patents in Suit are invalid and unenforceable for failing to satisfy one or more conditions of patentability set forth in Part II of Title 35 of the United States Code, including but not limited to Sections 101, 102, 103, and/or 112.

**THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

21. Plaintiff is estopped from construing any valid claim of the Patents in Suit to cover or include, either literally or by application of the doctrine of equivalents, any product, method or system manufactured, used, imported, sold, or offered for sale by i2 because of admissions and statements made to the United States Patent and Trademark Office (“USPTO”) or because of amendments made to the claims of the Patents in Suit or related patents during the prosecution of the applications leading to the issuance of the Patents in Suit or related patents.

**FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

22. Plaintiff is estopped by reason of prosecution history estoppel from asserting infringement of the Patents in Suit by application of the doctrine of equivalents.

**FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

23. Plaintiff is not entitled to injunctive relief because any alleged injury to the Plaintiff is not immediate or irreparable, and Plaintiff has an adequate remedy at law.

**COUNTERCLAIMS**

For its Counterclaims against SAP Aktiengesellschaft (“Counterclaim-Defendant”), Counterclaim-Plaintiff i2 alleges as follows:

**JURISDICTION**

1. This is an action for Declaratory Relief for which this Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1338, 1367(a), and 2201.

2. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Counterclaim-Defendant. Counterclaim-Defendant has consented to the personal jurisdiction of this Court by bringing this action.

**VENUE**

3. Venue for i2’s Counterclaims is proper in this judicial district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391. Counterclaim-Defendant has also consented to venue in this Court by bringing

1 this action.

2 **PARTIES**

3 4. i2 Technologies, Inc. (“i2”) is a Delaware Corporation with a place of business at  
4 11701 Luna Road, Dallas, Texas 75234. i2 also has an office at 1250 Oakmead Parkway, Suite  
5 210, Sunnyvale, California 94085.

6 5. Upon information and belief, Counterclaim-Defendant SAP Aktiengesellschaft is a  
7 German corporation with its headquarters at Dietmar-Hopp-Allee 16, 69190, Walldorf, Germany.  
8 Upon information and belief, SAP is that parent company of SAP America, Inc., which in turn is  
9 the parent of SAP Labs, LLC, a subsidiary headquartered at 3475 Deer Creek Road, Palo Alto,  
10 California.

11 6. By its Complaint, Counterclaim-Defendant purports to be the owner of United  
12 States Patent Nos. 6,407,761 (“the ‘761 patent”), 6,750,766 (“the ‘766 patent”), and 7,222,369  
13 (“the ‘369 patent”) (collectively, “the Patents in Suit”), and to assert claims against i2 for  
14 infringement of the Patents in Suit.

15 **BACKGROUND**

16 7. Counterclaim-Defendant sued i2 for alleged infringement of the ‘761 patent and  
17 the ‘766 patents in this Court on August 15, 2007. Counter-Defendants sued i2 for alleged  
18 infringement of the ‘369 patent in this Court on April 15, 2008.

19 8. i2 has denied Counterclaim-Defendant’s claims of infringement and contends that  
20 the Patents in Suit are invalid and unenforceable under Title 35 of the United States Code.

21 9. An actual controversy has arisen and now exists between i2 and Counterclaim-  
22 Defendant as to the non-infringement, invalidity, and unenforceability of the Patents in Suit.

23 **COUNT I - DECLARATION OF NON-INFRINGEMENT**

24 10. Counterclaim-Defendant in this action has asserted that i2 is infringing the Patents  
25 in Suit by manufacturing, using, importing, marketing, selling, reselling, offering for sale, and/or  
26 inducing others to use products falling within the scope of the claims of one or more of the  
27 Patents in Suit.

11. No product made, used, imported, marketed, sold, resold, and/or offered for sale by i2 infringes any claim of the Patents in Suit.

12. i2 seeks a declaration that it has not infringed and does not infringe the Patents in Suit, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents.

**COUNT II - DECLARATION OF PATENT INVALIDITY**

13. The claims of the Patents in Suit are invalid for failure to satisfy the provisions of Title 35 of the United States Code, including, but not limited to, 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102, 103, and/or 112.

14. i2 seeks a declaration that the Patents in Suit are invalid and/or unenforceable.

**PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, having fully answered and counterclaimed, i2 prays for judgment as follows:

A. That this Court enter judgment in favor of i2 on Plaintiff's claims against i2 and order that Plaintiff take nothing from i2;

B. That this Court find and declare that i2 has not infringed any claim of the Patents in Suit;

C. That this Court find and declare that the Patents in Suit are invalid and/or unenforceable;

D. That this Court award i2 all of its costs of this action;

E. That this Court find that this is an exceptional case and award i2 its attorneys' fees pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 285 or otherwise; and

1 F. That this Court grant i2 such other and further relief as the Court shall deem just  
2 and proper.

3  
4 Dated: May 5, 2008

PAUL, HASTINGS, JANOFSKY & WALKER  
LLP

5  
6  
7 By: /s/ Jason K. Sonoda  
Jason K. Sonoda

8 Attorneys for Defendant  
9 12 Technologies, Inc.

10 MCKOOL SMITH, P.C.  
11 Theodore Stevenson, III , III (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
12 [tstevenson@mckoolsmith.com](mailto:tstevenson@mckoolsmith.com)  
13 Scott W. Hejny (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
14 [shejny@mckoolsmith.com](mailto:shejny@mckoolsmith.com)  
15 Luke F. McLeroy ( *Pro Hac Vice*)  
16 [lmcleroy@mckoolsmith.com](mailto:lmcleroy@mckoolsmith.com)  
17 300 Crescent Court, Suite 1500  
18 Dallas, TX 75201  
19 Telephone: (214) 978-4000  
20 Facsimile: (214) 978-4044

21 Attorneys for Defendant  
22 12 Technologies, Inc.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

Counterclaim-Plaintiff i2 requests a trial by jury on all issues so triable.

Dated: May 5, 2008

PAUL, HASTINGS, JANOFKY & WALKER  
LLP

By: /s/ Jason K. Sonoda  
Jason K. Sonoda

Attorneys for Defendant  
i2 Technologies, Inc.

MCKOOL SMITH, P.C.  
Theodore Stevenson, III, III (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
[tstevenson@mckoolsmith.com](mailto:tstevenson@mckoolsmith.com)  
Scott W. Hejny (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
[shejny@mckoolsmith.com](mailto:shejny@mckoolsmith.com)  
Luke F. McLeroy (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
[lmcleroy@mckoolsmith.com](mailto:lmcleroy@mckoolsmith.com)  
300 Crescent Court, Suite 1500  
Dallas, TX 75201  
Telephone: (214) 978-4000  
Facsimile: (214) 978-4044

Attorneys for Defendant  
i2 Technologies, Inc.



**PROOF OF SERVICE BY ELECTRONIC MAIL**

I am a citizen of the United States and employed in San Francisco County, California. I am over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the within-entitled action. My business address is 55 Second Street, Twenty-Fourth Floor, San Francisco, California 94105-3441.

On May 5, 2008, I served a true and correct copy of:

**DEFENDANT i2'S ANSWER AND COUNTERCLAIMS TO PLAINTIFFS' SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT**

**X VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL:**

Pursuant to the operation of the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California E-Filing system, all parties above have been served via e-mail; per Local Rule 5-4 and General Order 45.

as follows:

Michael J. Sacksteder  
Fenwick & West LLP  
555 California Street, Suite 1200  
San Francisco, CA 94104

Hector J. Ribera  
Fenwick & West LLP  
Silicon Valley Street  
801 California Street  
Mountain View, CA 94041

David L. Hayes  
Fenwick & West LLP  
Silicon Valley Street  
801 California Street  
Mountain View, CA 94041

Saina Sason Shamilov  
Fenwick & West LLP  
Silicon Valley Street  
801 California Street  
Mountain View, CA 94041

Todd R. Gregorian  
Fenwick & West LLP  
Silicon Valley Street  
801 California Street  
Mountain View, CA 94041

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on May 5, 2008, at San Francisco, California.

By: /s/ Carol Alexander  
Carol Alexander

LEGAL\_US\_W # 58844339.1